DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 335 CG 030 792

AUTHOR Hyman, Irwin A.; Winchell, Kris; Tillman, Timothy C.
TITLE Treatment Integrity and Satisfaction Using the Teacher Variance Approach: A Multidimensional Method for Dealing with Teacher Resistance.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists (Washington, DC, April 17-21, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; *Counseling; Elementary Secondary Education; Models; Personality Theories; *Resistance (Psychology); School Psychologists; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Consultant Role

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an overview and rationale for a systematic, multidimensional, theory-driven model of consultation for the school psychologist based on the Teacher Variance approach. Teacher Variance, a combination of five theoretical approaches to preventing, diagnosing, and remediating misbehavior, suggests a solution for the treatment of teacher resistance. The model is a logical combination of predominate theories of personality and behavior, including behavior/cognitive, biophysical, psychodynamic, humanistic, and ecological systems. These orientations are utilized when appropriate in relation to the teacher's preferred approach and when supported by empirical research. Following a description of the model and a brief overview of teacher attribution, case studies are presented illustrating the power of a flexible orientation for school psychologists to employ when conducting school-based consultation. (Contains 59 references.) (Author/JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 335

Treatment Integrity and Satisfaction Using the Teacher Variance Approach: A Multidimensional Method for Dealing with Teacher Resistance

by
Irwin A. Hyman
Kris Winchell
Timothy C. Tillman

CG030792

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
I. Hyman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Treatment Integrity and Satisfaction Using the Teacher Variance Approach: A Multidimensional Method for Dealing With Teacher Resistance *

Irwin A. Hyman
Temple University

Kris Winchell
Egg Harbor City NJ Schools

Timothy C. Tillman
Temple University

This paper presents an overview and rationale for a systematic, multidimensional, theory-driven model of consultation based on the Teacher Variance (TV) approach. This consultation model is a logical combination of predominant theories of personality and behavior, including the behavioral/cognitive-behavioral, biophysical, psychodynamic/interpersonal, humanistic, and ecological/systems approaches. These orientations are utilized when appropriate in relation to the teacher's preferred approach and when supported by empirical research. Following a brief description of the model and its rationale for dealing with teacher resistance we present case studies which illustrate the power of a flexible orientation when conducting school-based consultation.

Introduction

School psychologists are frequently faced with the problem of teacher resistance during consultation (Conoley & Conoley, 1992). This issue has been well researched and is particularly evident when teachers are offered a behavioral approach (Axelrod, 1992; Bergan, & Tombari, 1976; Martens, & Kelly, 1993). Although psychologists and teachers often work together to develop an appropriate behavioral plan, frequently the plan is undermined as a result of conscious or unconscious resistance manifested by the teacher's failure to maintain treatment integrity.

School personnel often have negative associations about behavioral techniques (Conoley & Conoley, 1992). This negative perception may be related to a number of factors (Conoley & Erchul, 1991). These include the consultant's use of behavioral techniques without regard for consultee's preference for or comfort with them, over-involvement on the part of the consultant who fails to reinforce the relationship with the consultee, and/or the consultant's use of technical language that alienates the consultee (Conoley and Erchul, 1991).

Of the available approaches to school consultation, behavioral theory dominates most of the contemporary literature (Zins & Erchul, 1995). Behavioral approaches are reported more than are those

---

*Paper presented at the NASP 2001 Convention, April 21, 2001, Washington, D.C.
This is an edited version of a similar paper presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August 7, 2000, Washington, D.C.. The authors are indebted to Julia Zurndorfer, doctoral student in school psychology at Temple University, for her contribution of the case example presented in this paper.

CG030792

rooted in mental health, humanistic, psychodynamic, ecological or systems theories. This is in part due to the fact that behavioral outcome measures of efficacy are more easily demonstrated. Behavioral interventions are amenable to current, acceptable research methodology, which depends on techniques using single-subject designs. Academicians and practitioners may use these techniques to conduct multiple studies with relatively limited resources and extremely small numbers of subjects. Comparatively, there is little research in consultation based on other models, since the ideal experimental methodology requires pre and post-treatment measures with the Solomon Four-Group Design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This recommended method, which is rarely used, offers the ideal for determination of treatment efficacy. Even two-group studies using analysis of covariance with experimental and control conditions offer daunting problems in terms of time and resources. Further, certain consultation approaches, including but not limited to the humanistic and psychodynamic orientations, do not lend themselves to measurable outcomes as easily as those defined in the behavioral approach.

For instance, since the goal of the behavioral approach is to change a targeted behavior in a specific situation, there is relatively little concern about the teacher's beliefs or transferability of the method to similar situations. However, the psychodynamic/interpersonal approach is grounded in the assumption that a teacher who gains insight into the reasons why a child misbehaves and is able to develop commensurate treatment procedures will transfer this insight into other situations. Problems with methodology, lack of funding, limited resources and the current zeitgeist are all factors which have constrained research and publications in this area. However, the lack of research on other models of consultation should not be construed as proof of the efficacy of behavioral approaches over others (Erchul & Raven, 1997).

Despite their prevalence in the literature, behavioral interventions often meet with teacher resistance in the consultation relationship, frequently leading to failure. Conoley, Conoley, Ivey & Scheel (1991), Zins & Erchul (1995) and others address this issue within the context of treatment acceptability

by the consultee. Acceptability is related to a variety of contextual factors. Of particular importance are those factors related to the goodness of fit between attitudes, values, orientations, understanding of the sources of problem behavior and treatment strategies of both the consultant and the consultee.

During a symposium last year, Bill Erchul, Terry Gutkin and Joel Myers critiqued this model as an approach to dealing with teacher resistance. Gutkin (2001) emphasized the uniqueness of this model in that it views consultation "through the eyes of the consultee." This approach helps consultees to know themselves better and enables them to understand their failures in working with children. Erchul (2000) concurred that this paradigm offers a "consultee-centered approach versus the one-size fits all mentality." One of the strengths is that it reflects the "Big Three" of consultation, which include ecological-organizational, mental health, and behavioral approaches. Meyers (2000) briefly commented on his long acquaintance with the development of this approach and its potential. While there were methodological critiques regarding outcome measures, these are not unique to the filed of consultation. The comments of these researchers lend credence to the concepts which drive the TV approach. The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of this approach in dealing with resistance in teacher consultation.

The Teacher Variance Approach

Teacher Variance (Hyman, Dahbany, Blum,Brooks- Klein, Weiler, & Pokalo, 1997), which is based on five theoretical approaches to preventing, diagnosing and remediating misbehavior, suggests a powerful solution to the problem of teacher resistance. The TV Training Model (TVTM) is particularly promising because of its consideration of an essential contextual feature of the teacher-training milieu, namely, the teacher's schema for understanding human behavior. Unique features of the TVTM, which set it apart from other discipline training programs include: its incorporation of five different theoretical orientations regarding beliefs about human behavior; assumption that the most effective discipline approach for an individual teacher is one that complements the teacher's beliefs (i.e., theoretical orientation) about student behavior; and its ultimate promotion of professional growth by giving teachers the opportunity to become familiar with other discipline approaches (orientations). Ideally, by gaining knowledge of, and

competence with, a variety of disciplinary orientations, the teacher may eventually reach the status of a "complete disciplinarian" (i.e., one who can apply interventions from any given approach, as needed).

The five broad theoretical perspectives included within the TVTM are: (1) Behavior/Cognitive-Behavioral, (2) Psychodynamic/Interpersonal, (3) Humanistic, (4) Ecological/Systems, and (5) Biophysical (Hyman, et. al. 1997). These categories were developed based on the most prevalent orientations as established by research and literature reviews (Hyman, Lally, Lennox, Pokalo, Robinson, & Wapner-Cohen, 1983; Hyman, Dahbany, Bium, Weiler, Klein, & Pokolo, 1997; Marchon-Tully, 1987).

The Teacher Variance Inventories

To implement the TVTM, various revisions of the Teacher Variance Inventory (TVI) have been developed since the late 1980's. The TVI-III which is published in the text, School Discipline and School Violence: The Teacher Variance Approach (Hyman et al., 1997), has proven to be quite useful in teacher training and consultation. The latest version, the TVI-IV, will be discussed in the second paper in this symposia and, therefore, will not be detailed here. Publication of this version is currently being discussed with a major test publisher.

As noted above, resistance is often based on a mismatch between approaches offered by the consultant which are not commensurate with the consultee's ideology. Resistance, also called lack of treatment acceptability, may also be a contributing factor in the lack of treatment integrity that has been noted in the literature and is addressed in the last paper of this symposia (Tillman, 2001). In addition to problems of match between consultant and consultee, resistance in the form of refusal of treatment acceptability is also related to causal attributions. In order to determine teachers' framework for conceptualizing student behavior, it is important to consider attributions, which they assign to students' misbehavior. The following is a discussion of this important issue and its relations to the TV model.

Causal Attribution

Over a decade ago, Clark and Peterson (1986) argued that the types of theories that have the most significant and far-reaching consequences are those that focus on the general causes of human behavior. This is consistent with our position that it is important to consider beliefs that teachers have about the

behavior of their students. Specifically, we are particularly interested in teachers' causal attributions (Bar-Tal, 1979; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Guttmann, 1982; Hughes, 1992; Levesque & Lowe, 1992; Weiner 1974). The following review may seem outdated since most of the citations come from the literature of the 1970's and 1980's. However, as far as we know, none of the findings have been contradicted nor are they widely cited in the school psychology consultation literature.

Teacher's causal attributions for students' misbehavior have been extensively studied (Carner, 1991; Guttmann, 1982; Hughes, 1992; Medway, 1979; Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983). It is important to identify perceived causes for misbehavior and link them with appropriate intervention strategies. Recognizing this, Rhodes, Tracy, and Head (1977) launched the Child Variance Project. These researchers sought to develop links between theories about causes of behavior and interventions with the goals of improving teachers' understanding of children's behavior and promoting better classroom management. This project later inspired the development of the TV approach (Hyman, et al., 1997). But before considering TV, we present a brief review of the literature on teacher attributions about student behavior.

Causal Attribution Studies of Classroom Behaviors

Many studies have indicated that teachers are more likely to implicate factors external to themselves for causing student misbehavior (Christenson, Ysseldyke, Wang, & Algozzine, 1983; Cunningham and Sugawara, 1988; Guttmann, 1982; Medway, 1979; Vernberg & Medway, 1981). Medway (1979) conducted a seminal study that focused on causal attribution and student behavior problems. He analyzed actual discipline referrals in which teachers were asked to attribute causality for the cited problems. Teachers tended to attribute causality of learning problems to student ability factors and attribute causality of behavior problems to home factors. Teachers who attributed student problems to lack of motivation were more likely to criticize a student's incorrect behavior.

A 1979 survey by the National Education Association (cited in Hughes, 1992, p. 275) revealed similar findings. Specifically, 95% of the teachers questioned attributed academic and behavioral difficulties to within-student characteristics and to factors in the child's home, 4% to the school system,

and only 1% to inappropriate instruction. Vernberg and Medway (1981) studied teachers' causal attributions and found that teachers cited home factors as the leading cause for misbehavior. Self-controllable child characteristics were identified as the second cause.

In summary, the studies described above, and others cited, clearly indicate that teachers generally attribute student misbehavior to factors within the student or to others who affect the student's life. Rarely do teachers ascribe student misbehavior to the teacher's own attempts to prevent, intervene, or punish misbehavior. Further, Brophy and Rohrkemper's (1981) conceptualized the issue on terms of problem ownership. The effects of problem ownership on teachers' attributional inferences were seen to influence thoughts about controllability and intentionality. Teachers perceived student-owned problems (e.g., "Kathy is a loner..." or "Jeff tries hard, but is the lowest achiever in the class...") as being uncontrolled by the student and unintentional. Also, teachers perceived shared problems as being uncontrollable and unintentional. Therefore, teachers tend to choose intervention strategies based on their causal attributions about student misbehavior (Carner, 1991; Hughes, 1992; Medway, 1979; Rohrkemper & Brophy, 1983).

For example, many teachers are likely to attribute aggressive behaviors to students' lack of desire to control themselves. Since the aggression is perceived as being entirely internally controlled by the student, teachers frequently punish the child for not controlling the misbehavior. This paradigm omits consideration of other causations including the teacher's lack of attention to the ecology of the classroom. For instance, aggressive behavior may result from a child's lack of ability to deal with the curriculum, bullying behavior by peers, teachers' verbal assaults and put-downs, or seating patterns.

Some studies have shown that teachers deal differently with non-conforming classroom behaviors which are not disturbing and disruptive to others. For instance, teachers do not necessarily clearly ascribe shy and anxious behavior to either internal or external causation and are not as adamant that the behavior is self-controllable as aggressive externalizing behaviors are. Interventions selected for shy and anxious students tend to be supportive (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Peterson & Barger, 1985; Hall, Villeme, & Burley, 1989).

While not dealing directly with misbehavor, Tollefson and Chen (1988) investigated consequences of teachers' attributions for student failure. They concluded that teachers' attributions for low effort may set in place a negative cycle. The results of this study make a case for attribution training for teachers to retrain thoughts such as, "This student doesn't care" to "This student is having difficulty getting started; if I help him start, he may try harder."

This brief overview of teacher attribution should offer convincing evidence that teachers' idiosyncratic beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors cannot be ignored in consultation. They form the basis for much of the resistance that is reported anecdotally and in the literature. We believe that TV offers a way of dealing with that resistance. Before turning to the use of TV in dealing with resistance, it is helpful to consider not only teacher attributions, but teacher traits which might cause resistance.

Trait Theory in the Context of Attribution Theory and Teachers' Causal Attribution

At the same time that the attribution theorists were observing that perceptions of behavior depended on who was doing the attributing, trait theory came under criticism because of the emphasis it put on the stable and enduring properties of the person. Trait theory holds that the personality structure is a collection of traits, which assume some pattern and regularity with behavior over time, and across situations (Allport, 1921, 1927; Cattell, 1965;Eysenck, 1947;Jones & Nisbett, 1972; Mischel, 1968; Monson, 1983; Pervin, 1987, 1993). This literature is important to the concept of resistance and consultation. It suggests that consultees may have enduring traits which influence their ability to benefit from consultation.

Despite early and continuing criticism of trait theory, there continues to be research examining the existence of traits, trait stability, and the biological basis of traits (Plomin & Bergeman, 1991). The current trend in looking at the genetic sources of traits has swung the pendulum back toward proponents of trait theory. Based on peer rating research by Norman in 1963, five factors were found and continue to be studied with a growing consensus as to their validity. This construct was once regarded with great skepticism for methodological and theoretical reasons (Mischel, 1968), however, it has gathered support from contemporary researchers (Goldberg, 1980; Costa & McCrae, 1985).

Goldberg (1980) identified the "The Big Five" dimensions that appear consistently in all measures of personality. These include Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Additional research has supported the factors and validity claims (Costa and McCrae, 1985). If these findings are accurate, consultants need to consider them in dealing with resistance. For instance, one would expect teachers with high degrees of openness and agreeableness to be less resistant to suggestions and collaborations than teachers who do not possess high levels of these traits. Using psychodynamic theory, we have observed high resistant teachers to possess certain traits which fall under the category of Neuroticism. The senior author, after forty years of consultation with teachers, has identified a group which might be labeled the "Projectors and Deniers." For example, after initial problem identification during which these teachers seem very open and forthcoming, they begin to project blame for their problems on a variety of external factors. Quite often they blame the school, the school system, the principal, the parents, and the child. They project blame constantly and even though they may make feeble attempts at interventions, their self-fulfilling prophesies about their helplessness to solve the problem are proven. They are often burned out and depressed. Understanding this type of resistance is often fruitless until the teacher gets help or through skilled consultation begins to try interventions. In our experience, this is rarely the case. Therefore, even though we continue consultation with these teachers in the hopes that things will change, it is often unproductive.

In summary, there is ample evidence to suggest that teachers' beliefs, attributions of causality and their personality traits all should be considered in the development of an approach to consultation and consultation resistance. However, these parameters alone cannot form an adequate basis for the development of effective intervention techniques. Another dimension must be considered. That is, teachers' attitudes. Teacher Variance offers the added dimension of allowing teachers to align their beliefs with one of five identified theoretical orientations. The TVI-IV helps to identify their responses to specific discipline situations, which offer systematic approaches to prevention, diagnosis and remediation. However, we felt it was important to determine not only specific contextual behaviors of teachers within the TV model, but also their general attitudes within the model.

The Teacher Variance Attitude Scale

In addition to the TVI scales, the Teacher Variance Attitude Scale (TVAS) was developed as a brief measure of teachers' general attitudes within the context of Teacher Variance theory (Cozzi, 1998). This scale comes closer to trait theory than the other aspects of the TV model. While more research needs to be conducted with this instrument, it augments the TVI since it is context free in that it addresses general beliefs rather than presenting teachers with concrete classroom management problems. Cozzi's scale, The Teacher Variance Attitude Scale, contains 35 statements. Each of the statements is designed to represent one of the five different theories described in the TVTM. References to context are avoided. The respondent is asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with each statement along a 5 point likert scale. The Teacher Variance Attitude Scale has sound psychometric properties which are reported elsewhere (Cozzi, 1998).

The Use of Teacher Variance in Dealing with Teacher Resistance

In the beginning of this paper we discussed how teacher attributions and traits are important to consider in dealing with teacher resistance. We also discussed the problem of teacher resistance in behavioral consultation, which is the most widely used approach. When there is a match between the behavioral approaches of the consultant and the consultee the problem of resistance is minimized. Resistance in these situations may be more related to the teachers' refusal to implement the detailed procedures required in an appropriate behavioral intervention. The consultant must deal with the resistance by offering adequate reinforcement for the teacher to overcome the perceived inconvenience incurred by following through with the agreed upon intervention. However, we believe that resistance to behavioral interventions may often be based on philosophical differences between the two parties. Therefore, successful consultation may occur as a result of a better match. The following is a limited discussion of the issues involved.

During the past five years, the senior author has supervised a series of ongoing single case studies as part of a one-year clinical practicum in consultation. In this practicum students spend three hours a week during both the fall and spring semesters in a consultation site. Students are required to keep logs

and to tape record teacher consultation sessions. The class, usually limited to no more than ten students, meets on a weekly basis for group supervision. During supervision, audio tapes are played, cases are discussed, and both the instructor and peers offer feedback. Students are most familiar with behavioral consultation because of the current dominance of behaviorism in the school psychology literature and its appeal as a scientific method for facilitating behavior change. In addition, students are required to complete a basic course in behavioral analysis. Therefore, it is assumed when they enter the consultation practicum that they are reasonably well trained in the basic theory and use of behavioral techniques.

In addition to behavioral training, students in the practicum have completed a one-semester course in the analysis of teaching. They are required to master the basic literature on teacher efficacy. This is accomplished in a course, which uses the texts, School Discipline and School Violence: The Teacher Variance Approach (Hyman et al., 1997) and Looking in Classrooms (Good & Brophy, 1997). Therefore, students are expected to understand behavioral analysis,

When teacher resistance occurs, especially in relation to student misbehavior, the consultants administer the TV scales. This may include both the TVI and the TVAS, depending on the situation. Here we will discuss just the use of the TVI, which can be introduced in several ways. First, the consultant can ask the teacher to complete the TVI in order to help the consultant gain a better understanding of the teacher's beliefs. The consultant may request that it be filled out and returned at the next session or they can complete the scale together. Although we do not have accurate data, compliance with the request to independently complete the TVI is probably about 50%. If it is not completed by the next consultation session, we frequently suggest sitting down to do it together. We do not offer teachers any pre-instruction regarding the nature of the five approaches in order to avoid potentially biasing teacher responses.

Once the scale is completed, either the teacher or consultant may score it. Feedback is crucial in this process. The nature of the feedback must be judged by the consultant, however, we have found that once the scale is completed and scored the consultant can give an overview of each of the five orientations. Therefore, the consultant must have an in-depth knowledge of the material and be skilled in

presenting each approach succinctly and meaningfully. After the overview, the consultant then goes over the first few items and shows the teacher how his or her responses are related to the various theoretical orientations. If the teacher quickly assimilates the information, the consultant encourages him or her to identify each of the responses in terms of theoretical orientation.

As previously mentioned, we have found that teachers tend to respond to the scale on the basis of contextual factors rather than exclusively in terms of a pure orientation toward one approach. The addition of selected interventions under ideal conditions in the TVI-IV will help resolve this issue by helping teachers to develop and utilize their desired orientation. Teachers may obtain equally high scores in several areas. Multiple high scores may suggest either that they (1) have a good understanding of each approach and therefore view several equally efficacious responses, (2) are willing to try anything, (3) responded in a shotgun manner by approving many alternative ways of handling the problem or (4) that they believe that each problem requires a situation specific response, regardless of theory. This can be discussed in terms of acceptable interventions. It is important for the consultant to tactfully explore with the consultee which of the above apply. For instance, if teachers obtain equal scores on almost all orientations, the consultation focus needs to be shifted in the direction of helping them identify an approach which is consistent with their own beliefs and the nature of the presenting problem.

While TV theory stresses the importance of goodness of fit between consultant and consultee, it is also based on the assumption that there is no one best approach for every problem. Therefore, teachers can adjust their approaches if they are willing to accept the need to fully comprehend an approach's theoretical assumptions, diagnostic strategies, and related interventions. They need to be committed to the point where they are willing to go back into the system if a particular remediation does not work in order to reassess their diagnosis. Ideally, teachers would master all the approaches and apply those approaches that appear most successful in a particular situation. For instance, a behavioral intervention may be unrealistic and unsuccessful when the teacher has no control over reinforcers that are desired by the student. Further, some students will refuse any reinforcement for a variety of reasons, including the fact that irritating the teacher is the best reinforcer the student can comprehend. However, those same

students may respond to interpersonal interventions based in psychodynamic theory or ecological changes based on the ecological/systems approach.

Each of the theories offers an explanation for the basis of teacher resistance. For instance, a behavioral approach would suggest that if resistant teachers really understood behavior analysis they would be happy to apply the principles that are invariably successful. Therefore, to overcome the resistance, the consultant must fully educate teachers regarding the research base, which demonstrates the efficacy of behavioral interventions. However, a consultant who is a behaviorist might also benefit from understanding teacher resistance within another theoretical framework. For example, using a psychodynamic approach, the consultee resistance might be understood in terms of objectivity. Perhaps a teacher might fail to carry out behavioral interventions because of dislike of the student. The student might unconsciously remind the teacher of a hostile sibling or another significant figure that made the teacher's life miserable at some time in the past. Or the teacher might be unconsciously angry with the consultant whose demeanor is suggestive of an authoritarian father or principal. The senior author, in presenting advanced workshops in several states has found that many psychologists have a limited repertoire in applying various theories to understand teacher resistance. Therefore, in order to consult using the TV approach the psychologist must thoroughly understand each of the orientations and be able to realistically develop remediations. The following is a case study illustrating the research and theory we have presented thus far.

The Case of Ms. Smith: chaos, Catholicism and resolution

Ms. Smith was a first-year 8th grade teacher at an urban Catholic school who was in the process of earning a masters degree at a local Catholic university. Consultation focused on assistance in maintaining order in her classroom. She was frustrated with the class and unsure how to improve the environment. She described the students as being extremely disrespectful toward her and toward each other. The students talked to one another, picked fights and refused to listen when Ms. Smith was trying to teach.

Ms. Smith agreed to fill out the TVI-IV and the TVAS. However, she was somewhat resistant to following through in a timely manner. It took three weeks for her to complete the survey and return it to the consultant. Ms. Smith's scores were as follows:

Teacher Variance Inventory

Cause Orientation		Actual Intervention Orientation		Ideal Intervention Orientation	
Humanistic	16	Humanistic	25	Humanistic	25
Biophysical	14	Biophysical	13	Biophysical	14
Behavioral	15	Behavioral	21	Behavioral	18
Psychodynamic	15	Psychodynamic	12	Psychodynamic	12
Ecological	13	Ecological	18	Ecological	21

Teacher Variance Attitude Scale

Orientation	T-Score
Humanistic	69
Biophysical	39
Behavioral	55
Psychodynamic	55
Ecological-Systems	56

In reviewing Ms. Smith's profile it was clear that her scores on the various approaches were fairly close. However, since her highest scores were in the humanistic orientation, she decided she would like to utilize that approach in consultation. Further, she felt that the humanistic ideas expressed on the scales were consistent with her strong Catholic ideology. On the TVI, she indicated that academic struggles and classroom behaviors represent a student's need for approval and expression of unmet needs. Maximum scores were attained within the humanistic category for both actual and ideal intervention orientations. Scores on the TVAS were commensurate with scores on the TVI. It is noteworthy, however, that Ms. Smith's responses on the TVI for Cause Orientation were more diverse. This would suggest that she believed that a child's behavior may be caused by a variety of different factors but that the best intervention, regardless of the cause, stems from a humanistic approach.

Ms. Smith was not surprised by the results of the TVI and TVAS. She thought they accurately reflected her teaching beliefs and represented the type of training she received in college. Ms. Smith

requested that consultation sessions focus on helping her learn more about the humanistic model from a theoretical standpoint and how the model can be practiced in the classroom.

The next several sessions were spent detailing how the humanistic model operates. Through a collaborative effort, Ms. Smith created ideas, from a humanistic model, that she could incorporate into her classroom. These included restructuring communication with students to reflect the teacher's unconditional positive regard and understand of the students' needs. She considered that, rather than reacting with immediate censure to individual misbehaviors, it would be best to help the student to process the reasons for the misbehavior. Ms. Smith also worked on an integration of Catholic teachings about love and acceptance with the realities of a hierarchical Catholic School system. Unfortunately, each idea was met with resistance. After one or two attempts, Ms. Smith would give up on the approach stating that it was unsuccessful and would not work with her students. She said the students refused to listen to each other and would continue to misbehave. Furthermore, Ms. Smith felt as though the administration did not support such tactics.

Several examples can be cited where Ms. Smith's teaching style did not correlate with the Humanistic orientation. On the TVAS, Ms. Smith indicated that she strongly agreed with the statement, "All children are born with the will to achieve to their fullest potential and should be allowed to seek self-actualization." In consultant discussions, however, Ms. Smith often discussed motivation as having a genetic or behavioral basis.

Overall, Ms. Smith chose to motivate her students through rewards and punishment. As dictated by the humanistic approach and highlighted by her TVI responses in items 1,2 and 3, Ms. Smith believed that children need and should be given the opportunity to explore their environment and express their thoughts and feelings. However classroom observations revealed that her teaching style was predominately lecture-based. It included requests that students regurgitate information taught, therefore her classroom was far more structured then explorative. Unsolicited student questions and comments were viewed as disruptive rather then a part of the learning process.

After several weeks of failed attempts of trying to combine humanistic consultation with teaching Ms. Smith how to work within the humanistic construct, the consultant suggested that Ms. Smith begin to explore other models. Her scores in several subscales on the inventories revealed preferences for the behavioral and ecological/systems orientation which were not that much weaker than her scores for the humanistic approach. It should be noted that Ms. Smith's humanistic score on the TVAS was notably higher than other orientation scores on the TVAS. This was commensurate with her humanistic score on the "Ideal" intervention scale of the TVI-IV. This implies that in the real-world situation, Ms. Smith feels unable to employ interventions consistent with her ideology. The next few sessions focused on discussing behavioral and ecological orientations. Ms. Smith stated that she was interested in attempting to utilize the ecological approach.

Ms. Smith seemed to grasp the ecological model with ease. She found that her students were slightly more responsive and that the administration showed increased support. Out of class, Ms. Smith took time to think about how she presented instructions to the students and realized that she could better accomplish her teaching goals by consistently applying ecological procedures. She also took time to clarify classroom rules and expectations. Further, she encouraged students to write journal articles relating to the lesson topics. Although Ms. Smith was not interested in changing the total ecological system of the school to match her new-found techniques, she did increase communication with the other 8th grade teacher. Together they created a system by which the students transitioned between the classrooms. They worked together to create rewards for the 8th grade classes as a whole. Ms. Smith maintained that she would prefer to manage her class with a humanistic approach but stated that she realized that her class performed better when she practiced an ecological approach.

This case is typical of many teachers who do not clearly score high on all subscales in one orientation. The scale helped the consultant and teacher to clarify various approaches and to recognize inconsistencies between beliefs and practices. Ms. Smith was dedicated to Catholic ideals and was educated to carry these ideals out in the classroom. These approaches might have worked in an upper class private Catholic school, however, the inner city population with which she was dealing was not all

Catholic nor were the techniques that she had learned appropriate or easy to implement with the population of the classroom. Perhaps at a later date when control and respect were established, she might be able to move towards her ideal.

The following case illustrates how the TVI-IV and the TVAS can clearly identify internal conflicts even greater than that found with Ms. Smith.

Training School Psychologists in TVTM: The Case of a Public Confession

Last fall, the senior author presented a two-day workshop for school psychologists on the use of the TVTM in dealing with teacher resistance. During the first day, we focused on basic teacher variance concepts and conducted problem-solving. On the second day, participating school psychologists were presented with a one-day course on consultation and resistance. During one of the role-playing sessions, various protocols were considered to be analyzed by the workshop leader. Since each participant had filled out the TV scales, these were accurate reflections of their beliefs as evidenced by their scores. One of the participants presented a very interesting profile and volunteered to act as the consultee. All three scores on the TVI-IV were strongly behavioral (Cause orientation, Actual Intervention orientation, and Ideal Intervention orientation). However, on the TVAS, he was clearly humanistic.

During the consultation, the consultee was questioned about the discrepancy. He stated that he felt comfortable and proficient with behavioral techniques, which he applied in his consultation with teachers. He further reported the common complaint that teachers rarely complied with behavioral treatment interventions, which he carefully worked out with them. As we began to discuss his feelings, the discrepancy in the scale results was noted.

The consultee indicated that his training in school psychology was conducted within a humanistic-Rogerian context. He felt strongly committed to humanistic ideals and techniques, which he learned many years ago in graduate school. However, he faced the realities of recent regulations requiring functional assessment and behavioral plans as part of IDEA. We explored this conflict which helped him to understand his unconscious resentment regarding theories and methods which he must use because of regulations. He indicated that perhaps this was a reason why he had trouble dealing with

teacher resistance. Perhaps he could use his humanistic understandings and methods of communication to help teachers understand their own resistance to behavioral interventions. While this was a brief public consultation, it was fascinating for both the consultant and consultee. The consultee's problems, of course, were not resolved in the context of this brief session. However, the experience pointed to the potential powerful use of both scales (TVI and TVAS) for use in consultation.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, this paper presented an overview of the development of the TV approach and some applications for its use in consultation to deal with teacher resistance. The TVI and the TVAS are important tools in helping to establish compatibility between consultant and consultee. These tools allow consultants to introduce the consultees to a theoretical framework for conceptualizing their own personal philosophies about student behavior. The TVI-IV allows consultees to identify the implicit philosophies they use for explaining the origins (causes) of misbehavior and which philosophies they consider to be most effective for determining interventions. This inventory also allows for the determination of inconsistencies between perceived causes of misbehavior, actual interventions which they might use and ideal interventions. The TVAS allows for determination of general attitudes about the nature of human personality, behavior, and misbehavior. Clinical experience and anecdotes from teachers suggest tremendous potential for the use of the TV tools in consultation in dealing with resistance. The following two papers detail current research on the TVI-IV and offer some single-subject studies, which help to validate the use of the TV approach in dealing with teacher resistance.

REFERENCES

Allport, Floyd H. & Allport, Gordon W. (1921). Personality traits: Their classification and measurement. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *16*, 6-40.

Allport, Gordon W. (1927). Concepts of trait and personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *24*, 284-293.

Axelrod, S. (1992). Disseminating an effective educational technology. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 25, 31-35.

Bergan, J. R. & Tombari, M. L. (1976). Consultant skill and efficiency and the implementation and outcomes of consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 14, 3-4.

Martens, B. K. & Kelly, S. Q. (1993). A behavioral analysis of effective teaching. School Psychology Quarterly, 8, 10-26.

Bar-Tal, D. (1979). Interactions of teachers and pupils. In J. H. Frieze, D. Bar-Tal, & J. Carroll (Eds.). New approaches to social problems (pp. 337-358). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bergan, J. R. (1977). Behavioral Consultation, Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Blum, M. (1994). Survey of discipline training programs in preservice teacher programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Pennsylvania.

Brophy, J. & Rohrkemper, M. (1981). The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology-III, 73, 295-311.

Carner, L. A. (1991). Teachers' and psychologists' causal attributions for classroom problems and their relation to preferred consultation strategies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York University.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In N.L. Gage Ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 171-246). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Cattell, R. B. (1965) The scientific analysis of personality, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Christenson, S., Ysseldyke, J., Wang, J., & Algozzine, B. (1983). Teachers' attributions for problems that result in referral for psychoeducational evaluation. Journal of Educational Research, 76, 174-180.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teacher's thought processes. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 255-296). New York: MacMillan Publishing.

Conoley, J. C. & Conoley, C. W. (1992). School Consultation: Practice and training, 2nd Edition. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Conoley, C.W., Conoley, J. C., Ivey, D.C., & Scheel, M.J. (1991). Enhancing consultation by matching the consultee's perspectives. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 546-549.

Conoley, J. C. & Erchul, W. P. (1991). Helpful theories to guide counselors' practice of school-based consultation. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25, 204-211.

Cooper, H. M. & Good, T. (1983). Pygmalion grows up: Studies in the expectation communication process. New York: Longman.

Costa, P. T., Jr. & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO personality inventory manual. Psychological Assessment Resources: Odessa, FL.

Cunningham, B. & Sugawara, A. (1988). Preservice teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors. Journal of Educational Research, 82(1), 34-39.

Erchul, W. P. (2000). Commentary and reactions to symposium, "Teacher Resistance : Consultation Acceptability and Treatment Integrity." Presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August 7, 2000, Washington, D.C

Erchul, W. P., & Raven, B. H. (1997). Social power in school consultation: A contemporary view of French and Raven's bases of power model. Journal of School Psychology, 35, 137-171.

Eysenck, H. (1947). Dimensions of personality. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Goldberg, L. R. (1980). An alternative "description" of personality: The big five factor structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 1216-1229.

Gutkin, T. (2000). Commentary and reactions to symposium, "Teacher Resistance : Consultation Acceptability and Treatment Integrity." Presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August 7, 2000, Washington, D.C

Guttmann, J. (1982). Pupils, teachers, & parents' causal attributions for problem behaviors at school. Journal of Educational Research, 76(1), 4-21.

Hall, B. W., Villeme, M. G., & Burley, W. W. (1989). Teachers' attributions for students: academic success and failure and the relationship to teaching level and teacher feedback practices. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 14, 133-144.

Hughes, J. N. (1992). Social psychology foundations of consultation. In F. J. Medway & T. P. Cafferty (Eds.), School psychology a social psychology perspective (pp.269- 304). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hyman, I., Dahbany, A., Blum, M., Klein-Brooks, V., Weiler, E., & Pokalo, M. (1997). School discipline and school violence: The teacher variance approach. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hyman, I., Lally, D., Lennox, N., Marshon, S., Pokolo, M., Robinson, A. & Wapner-Cohen, M. (1983). Seven approaches to discipline. Philadelphia: Temple University, National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives in the Schools.

Hyman, I. A., Pokalo, M, Klein-Brooks, V., Webster, D., & Scirica, S. (1995). Teacher Variance Inventory--III. Published by National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternative. Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1972). The actor and the observer. Divergent perceptions about the causes of behavior. In E. E. Kanouse, D. E., Kelley, H. H, Nisbett. R. E., Valens, S., & Weiner, B. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kernberg, O. (1976). Object Relations Theory and Clinical Psychoanalysis. New York: Aronson.

Korevaar, G., & Bergen, T. (1992). Experienced teachers' attributions and their reactions in problematic classroom situations. Teaching and Teacher Education, 8(5,6), 509-521.

Levesque, M. J. & Lowe, C. A. (1992). In F. J. Medway & T. P. Cafferty (Eds.). School psychology a social psychology perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marchon-Tully, S. (1987). Child Variance Inventory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Temple University, Pennsylvania.

Medway, F. J. (1979). Causal attributions for school-related problems: Teacher perceptions and teacher feedback. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 809-818.

Meyers, J. (2000). Commentary and reactions to symposium, "Teacher Resistance : Consultation Acceptability and Treatment Integrity." Presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August 7, 2000, Washington, D.C

Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Monson, T. C. (1983). Implications of the traits v. situation controversy for differences in attributions of actors and observers. In J. Jaspars, F. D. Fincham & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Attribution theory and research: Conceptual, developmental and social dimensions. New York: Academic Press.

Nisbett, R. E. & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structures in peer nomination personality ratings, Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 66, 574-583.

Pervin, L. A. (1987). Personality: Theory and research (5th Ed). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Pervin, L. A. (1993). Personality: Theory and research (6th Ed). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Peterson, P. L., & Barger, S. (1985). Attribution theory and teacher expectancy. In J. Dusek (Ed.), Teacher Expectancies. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Plomin, R., & Bergeman, C. S., (1991). The nature of nurture: Genetic influence on "environmental" measures. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 14, 373-385.

Rhodes, W. C., Tracy, M. L., & Head, S. (1977). In W. C. Rhodes & M. L. Tracy (Eds.). A study of child variance, (Vol. 1.) Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Rohrkemper, M. M. & Brophy, J. E.(1983). Teachers' thinking about problem students. In John M. Levine and Margaret C. Wong (Eds.). Teacher and student perceptions: Implications for learning. Lawrence Earlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ.

Russell, D. (1982). The Causal Dimension Scale: A measure of how individuals perceive causes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 1137-45.

Scirica, S M. (1996). Validation of the Teacher Variance Inventory—III. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Pennsylvania.

Tillman, C. (2000). A study of treatment integrity using the teacher variance approach. Paper presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August 7, 2000, Washington, D.C..

Tillman, C. (2001). Treatment integrity and satisfaction: Using the teacher variance consultation approach. Paper presented at the NASP 2001 Convention, April 21, 2001, Washington, D.C.

Tollefson, N. & Chen, J. S. (1988). Consequences of teachers' attributions for student failure. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(3), 259-265.

Tollefson, N., Melvin, J., & Thippavajjala, C. (1990). Prospective teachers' views of excuse-giving behavior. National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal, 3, 37-43.

Vernberg, E. M. & Medway, F. J. (1981). Teacher and Parent Causal Perception of School Problems. American Educational Research Journal, 18(1), 29-37.

Weiner, B. (1974). Achievement motivation and attribution theory. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Winchell, K. A. (2000). Improvement of the Factor Structure of the Teacher Variance Inventory. Unfinished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Pennsylvania.

Zins, J.E. & Erchul, W. P. (1995). Best practices in school consultation. Best Practices in School Psychology-III, pp. 609-623.